

The Isgur-Wise Function: A Lattice Determination from Pseudoscalar $\rightarrow$ Pseudoscalar Form Factors

UKQCD Collaboration – presented by James N. Simone*

Department of Physics, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9 3JZ, Scotland

Form factors for pseudoscalar $\rightarrow$ pseudoscalar decays of heavy-light mesons are found in quenched lattice QCD with heavy-quark masses in the range of approximately 1-2 GeV. The Isgur-Wise function, $\xi(\omega)$, is extracted from these form factors. Results are in good agreement with $\xi(\omega)$ derived from CLEO measurements for $B \rightarrow D^* \mu \nu$.

1. THE ISGUR-WISE FUNCTION

Matrix elements are parameterized in terms of two form factors $h_{\pm}$

$$\frac{\langle B(\vec{p}_b) | V^{\mu} | A(\vec{p}_a) \rangle}{\sqrt{m_a m_b}} = h_{+}(\omega; m_a, m_b) (v_a + v_b)^{\mu} + h_{-}(\omega; m_a, m_b) (v_a - v_b)^{\mu} \quad (1)$$

where v_a and v_b are the meson four-velocities and $\omega = v_a \cdot v_b$.

In the heavy quark limit, $m_{Q_{a,b}} \rightarrow \infty$, form factor h_{-} tends to zero while h_{+} approaches $\xi(\omega)$, the universal Isgur-Wise form factor[1].

At finite heavy-quark mass, $h_{\pm}$ are still related to $\xi(\omega)$ although there are now both short-distance perturbative corrections and nonperturbative corrections in powers of $1/m_Q$. Neglecting the power law corrections,

$$h_{+}(\omega) = \left[\hat{C}_1 + \frac{\omega + 1}{2} (\hat{C}_2 + \hat{C}_3) \right] \xi_{\text{ren}}(\omega) \quad (2)$$

$$h_{-}(\omega) = \frac{\omega + 1}{2} [\hat{C}_2 - \hat{C}_3] \xi_{\text{ren}}(\omega) \quad (3)$$

where the Wilson coefficients $\hat{C}_i$ have been computed at next-to-leading order by Neubert[2].

2. METHODOLOGY

An $O(a)$ -improved fermion action[3] was used to generate fermion propagators for 60 quenched gauge configurations on a $24^3 \times 48$ $\beta = 6.2$ lattice[4]. The three light-quark masses, m_q , and

*present address: Fermilab, Box 500, Batavia, IL, 60510, USA. e-mail: simone@fnal.fnal.gov. Talk given at *Lattice '93*, Dallas, Texas, Oct. 12–16, 1993.

the four heavy-quark masses, m_Q , used here are also used in our study of f_D and f_B on these same configurations[5]. Estimating the heavy-quark mass by the spin-average of the heavy-light pseudoscalar (P) and vector (V) meson masses, in the $m_q \rightarrow 0$ limit, we find, $m_Q \approx 1.5, 1.9, 2.1$, and 2.4 GeV. The light-quark masses in ratio to strange quark mass are $m_q/m_s \approx 0.41, 0.68$, and 1.3 .

We study euclidean three-point correlation functions

$$G^{\mu}(0, t, t_b; m_{Q_a}, m_{Q_b}, m_q, \vec{p}_a, \vec{p}_b) = \sum_{\vec{x}, \vec{y}} e^{i\vec{p}_b \cdot \vec{x}} e^{i\vec{q} \cdot \vec{y}} \left\langle P_b(\vec{x}, t_b) V^{\mu}(\vec{y}, t) P_a^{\dagger}(\vec{0}, 0) \right\rangle \quad (4)$$

where $\vec{q} = \vec{p}_b - \vec{p}_a$. Operator $P_a^{\dagger}$ creates a $Q_a \bar{q}$ pseudoscalar and P_b annihilates a $Q_b \bar{q}$ pseudoscalar. The current V^{μ} is a local $O(a)$ -improved vector current[6].

We set $t_b = 24$ and symmetrize correlators about this time. Correlators have lattice momenta $\vec{k}_b = (12a/\pi)\vec{p}_b = (0, 0, 0)$, $(1, 0, 0)$, and $0 \leq |\vec{k}_a|^2 \leq 2$. Quark mass m_{Q_b} can be either 2.4 or 1.9 GeV.

The ratio of a matrix element to the temporal component of the forward matrix element of the flavor-conserving current is extracted by taking the ratio of three-point functions

$$\frac{G^{\mu}(0, t, t_b; m_{Q_a}, m_{Q_b}, m_q, \vec{p}_a, \vec{p}_b)}{G^4(0, t, t_b; m_{Q_b}, m_{Q_b}, m_q, \vec{p}_b, \vec{p}_b)} \xrightarrow{t_b \gg t \gg 0} \frac{Z_a(\vec{p}_a)}{Z_b(\vec{p}_b)} \frac{E_b}{E_a} \times \frac{\langle B(\vec{p}_b) | V^{\mu} | A(\vec{p}_a) \rangle}{\langle B(\vec{p}_b) | V^4 | B(\vec{p}_b) \rangle} e^{-\delta E t}. \quad (5)$$

For all Lorentz components in the ratio that

Table 1
 ρ^2 vs $\xi(\omega)$ model for parameter set $\mathcal{A}$.

BSW	pole	ISGW	linear
$0.92 \left(\begin{smallmatrix} +20 \\ -18 \end{smallmatrix} \right)$	$0.89 \left(\begin{smallmatrix} +19 \\ -17 \end{smallmatrix} \right)$	$0.83 \left(\begin{smallmatrix} +13 \\ -13 \end{smallmatrix} \right)$	$0.73 \left(\begin{smallmatrix} +16 \\ -14 \end{smallmatrix} \right)$

are non-zero, a single minimal χ^2 fit, using the full correlation matrix, is found for the t dependence in Eqn. 5. Field normalizations $Z_{a,b}$, energies $E_{a,b}$, and $\delta E = E_a - E_b$ are constrained to values obtained in fits to the meson propagators[5]. Equation 1 is used with Eqn. 5 to find $h_{\pm}(\omega; m_a, m_b) / h_{+}(1; m_b, m_b)$. After extrapolating $h_{\pm}$ to the $m_q \rightarrow 0$ limit, relation Eqn. 2 is used to extract the Isgur-Wise function $\xi(\omega)$ from $h_{+}(\omega)$.

For flavor-conserving matrix elements, h_{-} should be exactly zero. To test this, we allow both $h_{\pm}$ to be free parameters in the χ^2 fit. For $m_Q = 1.5 \text{ GeV}$ and $m_q \rightarrow 0$ we find $|h_{-}| \lesssim 0.1$ which is within 1σ of zero. We then constrain h_{-} to zero in fits for flavor-conserving matrix elements.

3. RESULTS

• **Slope Parameter** The slope parameter, $\rho^2 \equiv -\xi'(1)$, is extracted by finding a minimum χ^2 fit of the lattice $\xi(\omega)$ to some possible forms for the Isgur-Wise function

$$\xi_{BSW}(\omega) = \frac{2}{\omega + 1} \exp \left(\left(1 - 2\rho_{BSW}^2 \right) \frac{\omega - 1}{\omega + 1} \right) \quad (6)$$

$$\xi_{pole}(\omega) = \left(\frac{2}{\omega + 1} \right)^{2\rho_{pole}^2} \quad (7)$$

$$\xi_{ISGW}(\omega) = \exp \left(-\rho_{ISGW}^2 (\omega - 1) \right) \quad (8)$$

as discussed in References [7], [2], and [8] respectively. Values obtained for ρ^2 should be relatively insensitive to the choice of parameterization since Equations 6-8 differ only at $O((\omega - 1)^2)$.

In the continuum limit, the forward matrix element of the flavor-conserving vector current has a known normalization. On the lattice, matrix elements are normalized by $\langle B(\vec{p}_b) | V^4 | B(\vec{p}_b) \rangle$ to reduce lattice artifacts and to cancel the local vector current renormalization Z_V . It is important to test the consistency of this normalization

Figure 1. The quantity $V_{cb} \xi(\omega)$ measured by CLEO for $B \rightarrow D^* \mu \nu$ (diamonds). The lattice form factor (fancy squares) has been scaled by $|V_{cb}| = 0.034$ as described in the text.

method. We fit lattice form factors to the function $N \xi_{BSW}(\omega)$ with both ρ^2 and the normalization, N , determined by the χ^2 fit. Typically, N differs from one by $\lesssim 3\%$ which is within 1σ . We then constrained N to one when finding ρ^2 .

Label as mass set $\mathcal{A}$ the combination of quark masses: $m_{Q_b} = 2.4 \text{ GeV}$, $m_{Q_a} = \text{any } m_Q$ and $m_q/m_s \rightarrow 0$. Values for ρ^2 obtained for this set of masses and Equations 6-8 are shown in Tab. 1. The table also shows ρ_{linear}^2 from $\xi_{linear} = 1 - \rho_{linear}^2(\omega - 1)$. Uncertainty estimates are obtained by a bootstrap procedure with only statistical uncertainties shown. The values obtained agree with other determinations[9] and our earlier results[10].

• **Measured Form Factors** In Fig. 1 we compare the lattice form factor for mass set $\mathcal{A}$ with $|V_{cb}| \xi(\omega)$ derived from CLEO[11] data for $B \rightarrow D^* \mu \nu$. A fit of the CLEO data to $|V_{cb}| \xi_{BSW}(\omega)$ with ρ^2 constrained to the lattice value ρ_{BSW}^2 of Tab. 1 yields

$$|V_{cb}| = 0.034 \left(\begin{smallmatrix} +3 \\ -3 \end{smallmatrix} \right) \left(\begin{smallmatrix} +2 \\ -2 \end{smallmatrix} \right) \sqrt{\frac{\tau_B}{1.49 \text{ ps}}}. \quad (9)$$

Table 2
 ρ_{BSW}^2 vs m_Q (GeV).

m_Q	1.9	2.4
ρ^2	$0.91^{(+43)}_{(-20)}$	$1.06^{(+66)}_{(-34)}$

The first error is the $\Delta\chi^2 = 1$ error in the fit to the experimental data and the second error reflects the uncertainty in ρ_{BSW}^2 . Statistical uncertainties in the lattice form factor are of the same size as the errors in the experimental form factor.

The figure shows the lattice $\xi(\omega)$ from $P \rightarrow P$ transitions and $\xi(\omega)$ from CLEO $P \rightarrow V$ decay data to be remarkably similar in shape. Further studies of heavy quark spin symmetry using $P \rightarrow V$ three-point functions are underway[12,13].

• **Heavy-Quark Mass Dependence** In Tab. 2 are values for ρ_{BSW}^2 from separate analyses of flavor-conserving matrix elements with $m_Q = 1.9$ and 2.4 GeV. The errors are large and the change in ρ^2 with m_Q is only about 0.5σ over the range of m_Q studied.

The $O(1/m_Q)$ corrections to Eqn. 2 that relates $h_+(\omega)$ to $\xi(\omega)$ may be small since, by Luke's theorem[14], there can be at most $O(1/m_Q^2)$ corrections to this relation at $\omega = 1$.

For mass set $\mathcal{A}$ with $|\vec{k}_b| = 0$, the variations in the values of $\xi(1)$ extracted from $h_+(1; m_a, m_b)$ are $\lesssim 0.5\%$ as m_{Q_a} is varied over the four possible values of m_Q . The differences are smaller than the statistical uncertainties. For $|\vec{k}_b| = 1$, the variations in $\xi(1)$ values are now as much as ten times larger than for the zero momentum case. However, the differences are still within 1σ of zero.

Tests using the relation in Eqn. 3, which is not protected from $O(1/m_Q)$ corrections by Luke's theorem, are more sensitive indicators of m_Q effects[15]. A study of h_- may then help characterize the nonperturbative power law corrections to $\xi(\omega)$ at finite m_Q .

• **Light-Quark Mass Dependence** In Tab. 3 we show ρ_{BSW}^2 at fixed light-quark mass for the heavy-quark masses of set $\mathcal{A}$. These values should also be compared the value of ρ_{BSW}^2 in Tab. 1 obtained in the chiral limit. The trend is for ρ^2 to decrease with decreasing light-quark mass. Fur-

Table 3
 ρ_{BSW}^2 vs m_q/m_s .

m_q/m_s	0.41	0.68	1.3
ρ^2	$1.09^{(+24)}_{(-11)}$	$1.19^{(+17)}_{(-10)}$	$1.31^{(+15)}_{(-6)}$

ther work is necessary to understand the chiral behavior of $\xi(\omega)$.

4. CONCLUSION

Using heavy quark symmetry and the lattice is an effective way to study $B \rightarrow D$ decays.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to acknowledge their conversations with C. Bernard, J. Mandula, M. Ogilvie, Y. Shen, and A. Soni concerning this work. This work was carried out on a Meiko i860 Computing Surface supported by SERC Grant GR/32779, the University of Edinburgh and Meiko Limited.

REFERENCES

1. N. Isgur and M. Wise, Phys. Lett. B232 (1989) 113; B237 (1990) 527.
2. M. Neubert, SLAC-PUB-6263 (1993).
3. B. Sheikholeslami and R. Wohlert, Nucl. Phys. B259 (1985) 572.
4. C. R. Allton, *et al.*, Edinburgh 93/524 (1993).
5. H. Wittig, these proceedings and Edinburgh 93/526 or SHEP 92/93-24.
6. G. Heatlie, *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. B325 (1991) 266.
7. M. Neubert and V. Rieckert, Nucl. Phys. B382 (1992) 97.
8. N. Isgur, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D39 (1989) 799.
9. Y. Shen, these proceedings. C. Bernard, *et al.*, BUHEP-93-15.
10. UKQCD collaboration, S. Booth, *et al.* Edinburgh 93/525 or SHEP 92/93-17 (1993).
11. CLEO collaboration, LEPTON-PHOTON 93 proceedings.
12. N.M. Hazel, these proceedings.
13. H. Hoerber, these proceedings.
14. M.E. Luke, Phys. Lett. B252 (1990) 447.
15. D.S. Henty, these proceedings.